1 (Case called)

2.3

MR. HELLMAN: Good morning. Matthew Hellman for the government, with Probation Officers Erin Weinrauch and Kristen Aliperti. I apologize to the Court. The delay is my responsibility.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Good morning, Mr. Hellman. And good morning, Ms. Weinrauch and Ms. Aliperti.

MR. MARVINNY: Good morning, your Honor. Federal Defenders of New York, by Jonathan Marvinny, for Samuel Waldman.

THE COURT: Good morning Mr. Marvinny, and good morning, Mr. Waldman. Is there a member of your family here in court today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, my wife.

THE COURT: Good morning. Thank you for coming to court this morning.

We are here today to address sentencing in connection with Mr. Waldman's admission of specification 2 of the violations of supervised release. That specification charged attendance at an event where Mr. Waldman was in the vicinity of minors without the prior approval of the probation office.

I would like to ask the probation department to begin today's proceedings by stating its view of the status of supervision and the recommendation with respect to a sanction.

2.3

MS. ALIPERTI: I would like to reflect for the record Mr. Waldman's admission to the spec and the seriousness of it. Since the last court appearance, with the religious holidays there have been some attendance issues at treatment. Some were excused, some were not made up, the individuals, because a lot of the holidays fell on his designated day.

I will add that since last appearance, especially with the modification of the condition regarding the Internet device, there continues to remain concern. Mr. Waldman had communicated that he maybe wanted to switch to a tablet that his children would also have access to, and we had to remind him that with this modification, which was implemented to assist him with having a better understanding, there remains a concern about a genuine understanding and appreciation for the conditions.

Given all of that, we would still uphold the recommendation of one week custody followed by 120 days, or 4 months, on the bracelet and a new 6-year term of supervised release, which would be a continuation of the original sentence.

THE COURT: The 4 months on the bracelet, is that location monitoring, GPS monitoring? What is the type of monitoring?

MS. ALIPERTI: Location monitoring.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Marvinny.

2.3

MR. MARVINNY: Your Honor, may I speak from the podium, please?

THE COURT: Yes, certainly.

MR. MARVINNY: Thank you.

Your Honor, our position is that neither the offense, the violation to which Mr. Waldman admitted guilt, nor any of the other charged violations warrant prison time.

I respectfully ask the Court to consider that this is the very first time Mr. Waldman is being sentenced for a violation of his supervised release. These were all grade C specifications. Mr. Waldman has admitted guilt to one. I dare say frequently defendants on their first violation who have been only charged with and convicted of grade C specifications are not sent to prison as a matter of course.

None of this, your Honor, is to say that the conduct is not serious or that it doesn't merit sanction. The probation office is seeking, after a prison term, a period of location monitoring, GPS monitoring. That is certainly the kind of very serious restriction on Mr. Waldman's liberty and freedoms that the Court could impose in lieu of prison time.

I just don't think Mr. Waldman, given his situation, given his conduct, and given his real efforts to improve since these violations were filed deserves prison time. The Court can impose something short of prison that is still a

# Iarcase M:15-cr-00139-LTS Document 97 Filed 12/03/18 Page 5 of 31

2.3

punishment, that doesn't take him away from his family, take him away from his job, take him away from his religious obligations.

I would also ask the Court not to lose sight of the fact that the big picture here is in many ways good. Mr. Waldman's last polygraph examination was in June, and it showed, quote, no significant responses. That was a positive polygraph examination. Since then he has been attending treatment.

I was given a letter -- I know the probation office has the same letter -- that I think was just referenced updating us on Mr. Waldman's participation. Yes, he has missed some sessions because of the religious holidays. But the therapist's report said -- I'm going to read it. It's a very short paragraph.

"Mr. Waldman is an active participant in group where he has been addressing pertinent issues, such as thinking errors, high-risk factors, and triggers that pertain to his offense cycle." He has been described as an active participant. He is not someone phoning it in, for lack of a better term. He is going and doing work.

Also, I think really important here, your Honor, is

Mr. Waldman has not returned to viewing any pornography

whatsoever since he was released in this case after his initial
sentence, much less viewing any child pornography. Nor has he

 Iamease
 1.15-cr-00139-LTS
 Document 97
 Filed 12/03/18
 Page 6 of 31

committed any crime, no crime at all.

He is charged with grade C specifications, which we admit are serious. But again, in the grand scheme of things, in the big picture, the record isn't terrible. It is not a record that warrants prison time.

The offense he pled guilty to was not informing his probation officer where some children who hadn't been identified previously showed up at the bris of his grandson.

This is a festive event, a religious event, an event involving Mr. Waldman's close family. It is what it is. He erred in not doing that, he has accepted responsibility for it.

It is part of a history of things that have been brought up to this Court before, that Mr. Waldman has a large family, extensive religious obligations. A lot of the violations here that are included in the paperwork come from those kinds of things.

There was an issue about the no deliberate contact provision. The probation office and I went back and forth. We then sought clarification from the Court. The Court made the Court's views very clear. We changed the language. Since then, even since before then, there has been no additional violation. Mr. Waldman hasn't had his friends' children over to his apartment. He hasn't had an incident like the one that occurred back in May at his grandson's bris. So he has really shown that he has attempted to comply.

It's been tough for him to navigate his life with the very serious restrictions that are in place because of supervision. That's how it should be. Those conditions are in place for a reason. They are in place both to protect the public, obviously, to make Mr. Waldman conform, and help him grow as a person. He has to adapt.

It was hard for him and it hasn't always been perfect, but from my point of view he has made efforts to comply, he has tried to get better. When the law and the rules have been explained to him clearly in a way that he grasps, he has attempted to follow them and he has made progress. We shouldn't lose sight of that either.

Your Honor, I'm not asking you to commend Mr. Waldman. I'm asking you to see a man who is trying, has not been perfect but is improving, who is going to continue to improve, and has already shown in the course of these proceedings, which have been exceptionally stressful for him, that he is willing to modify his behavior to conform. I think he is worth giving another chance.

Prison, even the short term the probation office is recommending, is a very serious sanction for a man with such a large family and responsibilities and work. We are asking you to impose a sentence short of prison that the Court thinks is adequate to address all the sentencing factors.

It is my fervent hope that you will never see us here

again, your Honor, at least not on this case, at least not for any negative reason. I think he has demonstrated enough compliance that it is worth sparing him prison time at this point, imposing some other sanction, and giving him a chance to show he can do better.

THE COURT: Thank you.

2.3

MR. MARVINNY: Thank you.

THE COURT: I will offer Mr. Waldman an opportunity to speak. I will first ask if Mr. Hellman wishes to be heard.

MR. HELLMAN: Please, your Honor, and briefly.

I think the position of the office of the United

States probation is eminently reasonable given the

circumstances. Mr. Marvinny's points are well taken. But even

in the time since we were last before the Court, there were

missed sessions. There are still questions about Internet
accessible devices.

Specifically, since the last time we were here, which was within the last six weeks, I believe, there were three missed sessions. This is important because the violations, which are grade C violations, consist of areas of slippage between what the responsibilities of a supervisee are and how those obligations are being met.

It appears that there is an inability to fully adopt the position of the office of probation and the strictures of the Court that have been imposed while on this period of

Iarcase 1:15-cr-00139-LTS Document 97 Filed 12/03/18 Page 9 of 31

2.3

supervised release. As counsel stated, they are in place for reasons that, frankly, cannot be more important.

So, while they represent grade C violations, they represent in certain ways death by a thousand cuts, where the obligations of the supervisee are not being met and are constantly a source of back-and-forth between the officer responsible for supervising Mr. Waldman and Mr. Waldman.

Those terms have been clarified. They are now spelled out in even greater detail than before. And they are really unmistakable, what the rules and responsibilities of the supervisee are. But Mr. Waldman has not met them.

So, a period of incarceration which is brief is merited in this case to absolutely underscore that, yes, we expect no future violations, there can be no future violations. Mr. Waldman should not be before the Court ever again on this or any other criminal matter.

There also needs to be emphasis placed on the past violation, which has been admitted, which will suit the supervisee or assist the supervisee in meeting all the conditions, maintaining safety in the community, and seeing that those 120 days on electronic supervision, if imposed by the Court, are totally uneventful from the perspective of the office of probation.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

2.3

Mr. Waldman, before I invite you to speak, I am going to ask a couple of questions for clarification of the probation officers.

One is as to the electronic location monitoring.

Would that be combined with particular hours of permission to be in and out of the house, or is it simply a matter of being able to know where he is, which I think would be GPS I'm suspecting?

MS. ALIPERTI: Your Honor, as you may recall, Mr. Waldman's original sentence involved 12 months of home detention based on electronic monitoring. The probation department would request that same level of monitoring, which is location monitoring.

He would be allowed out for work, religious purposes, and any other time-outs that are approved by the probation department. Other than his normal scheduled events, for which he would provide us a schedule, for anything else he would have to require permission, and he would expect to be only at the locations that he is approved to be at during those times.

THE COURT: Thank you. The second question is if I were to impose a sentence of incarceration, do you know whether the MCC, for instance, has a kosher catering facility or how we would handle the dietary restriction issues?

MS. ALIPERTI: I emailed with the liaison from the MCC, who detailed that both the MDC and MCC offer a kosher

 Ia@ase 1.15-cr-00139-LTS
 Document 97
 Filed 12/03/18
 Page 11 of 31

1 option for food.

2.3

THE COURT: Thank you. Would it be a matter of reporting as directed by the probation department or would I be setting a particular week? I have not dealt with this short period of time before, so I would like us all to know what you would anticipate what the logistics would be.

MS. ALIPERTI: Yes, your Honor could set a surrender date if you felt that was necessary. We had said what our recommendation was for the custodial term at the last court appearance, hoping that in preparation for today Mr. Waldman would get his affairs in order before that time. If your Honor was inclined to remand him today, we would set a date where he could surrender directly to the facility or to the marshals here, and they would transport him.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Waldman.

MR. MARVINNY: May he use the podium?

THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: There are a number of points.

Interestingly enough, I'd like to bring out the point that was just brought up by Ms. Aliperti, which was shocking to me, two points, and both of them were totally false.

For instance, I took off sessions for religious holiday, which of course were allowed. I have no days that I was supposed to make up. If I was supposed to make up, I would

# Iacase 1.15-cr-00139-LTS Document 97 Filed 12/03/18 Page 12 of 31

have been told by Ms. Aliperti or my therapist that these are your make-up days, and then, had I not gone to those days, I would recall missing the session.

None of that happened. There was no contact with me that I am required to make up any of those missed days. So I did not miss any sessions whatsoever. Nothing was spoken to me, emailed to me in any way, shape, or form. That was an outright lie, literally, where their made-up story made me look bad. Step one.

Step two, I have been begging for a cell phone that has no Internet access whatsoever, a cell phone with no Internet access. We have been going back and forth about this. It's still in the middle. There is such a thing in the orthodox community. They have such setups where they especially remove the Internet because they don't want kids getting ahold of it, whatever. This has gone back and forth.

Finally, Ms. Aliperti said, I don't think it is going to work, maybe look into a tablet. I said tablets are too big, etc. Finally, I said, maybe I found a small tablet. Again, I did not want a tablet. I was strictly looking for an email-only capable phone, that's it, no Internet. Now she takes it and turns it around on me and says, oh, and you wanted to get something that your children may be able to that ahold of.

By the way, had I gotten a tablet, I would have done

2.3

the exact same thing with that tablet, had removed the

Internet. Even though you don't have to, it can be monitored

by the monitoring software system. But I do not do that. I

remove it because I have children and for myself I do not want

Internet access. All I need is email for my business. So that

was a totally inaccurate and again making me look bad. There

are a lot of things that they have gone out of their way to

really make me look bad. That just came up now, so I had to

bring it up.

The two points and my main focus --

THE COURT: May I ask you something so that I'm clear.

This non-Internet-capable phone, what you are thinking of is something that has more features than a flip phone because you want to be able to have email on the phone?

THE DEFENDANT: Correct, but no Internet. There's a special thing where they set it up where there is no Internet access possible whatsoever, strictly all you can get is email, that's it. That's a very popular device in the community. Whether it will be allowed eventually or not, we are still looking into it and speaking to various people in the PO department, etc. That was my main desire. I wanted it at the time.

When we did discuss the tablet, she threw right back at me, oh, look, you have to be careful with the children. I didn't want the tablet. Even if I had it, I would remove the

Internet access on the tablet. You can do the same thing with a tablet as with a cell phone. The problem with the tablet is it is just too big for me. It's like this size as opposed to a cell phone. I just want to be able to access my email on the road wherever I am.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE DEFENDANT: My main point I want to bring out is that I have not been defiant in any way, shape, or form. I will bring up the two main points that have been brought up and show that I have been trying very hard to work with the system.

There have been times when things were not clear. The direct contact, the deliberate contact, which we will talk a lot more in a moment, that was always a very unclear point. As soon as it became very clear that Ms. Aliperti really was putting her foot down -- we may have other interpretations that we could eventually get to court and make sure -- that you just can't have kids over, immediately I told my therapist, cold turkey, there ain't no kids coming over to my house, finished, I accept it 100 percent. As difficult as that is, it's too bad, this is the way we're doing it. It's difficult for my wife, my kids. Tough. These are the requirements.

Going back to when that child came over and stayed overnight, which I know is an issue. It was an emergency call to my wife. My wife is here. She is ready to testify under oath to whatever I say now. I'm ready to testify under oath as

### Ia@a%e 1.15-cr-00139-LTS Document 97 Filed 12/03/18 Page 15 of 31

2.3

well. Emergency call. A parent called me. They have to go out of town, and they asked a favor, for the kid to stay over.

This was approximately December-January time, going way back.

At that point my wife said okay.

Why did she say okay? My wife can testify that I do not even say hello to children who come to the home. I don't say one word. You would think that they don't exist, literally don't exist. I'm not a social type of parent with thousands of hours with kids. Nothing.

I go to the front room. I have an office. I do not even say hello. I'm not saying it is the right thing to do or not, but it's a fact. Zero contact. It is not a question of deliberate. It's zero. It's not indeliberate. There is no contact whatsoever. My wife is very well aware of that.

This was an emergency. The parent is calling. We have questions about what "deliberate contact" means. She allowed the child to come over to sleep over. That's what happened. Later she notified me.

Believe me, I wasn't happy about this, but it happened already. It was an emergency and they had to go out of state. It happened. Trust me, I have nothing to do with kids that come to my home. But that is what happened.

So this wasn't a defiant let kids come over and sleep over. It was a circumstance that happened. Unfortunate. We maybe should have been more careful. The point is I am not

Ia@awaly.15-cr-00139-LTS Document 97 Filed 12/03/18 Page 16 of 31 defiant.

2.3

It's not that I don't care or whatever. It's not true. I have not missed sessions. I have not missed any sessions without permission the whole time for two years now. And wherever I had to make up a session, every single time I did. That can be checked up with the office, with the therapist's office.

That is with the child staying overnight.

The other thing I want to address, I have addressed it a number of times but it is something that again I want to show I'm not defiant. I was allowed a number of times to go to various family celebrations before this bris. Ms. Weinrauch knew I had a bar mitzvah, and she made sure that the rabbi in charge of the children there was aware of the situation. My father—in—law was there. Trusted adults were aware of the situation so as to keep an eye on me. Eric was the PO. No one ever told me if any other minor walks in, I have to walk out.

I had a bris two weeks ago. Ms. Aliperti -- and I appreciate that she did this, but even she backed off from that -- she herself just made sure that there was adult supervision. She did not tell me again that if a minor walks in, I have to step out. I appreciate that. But that was a little overstepping on the boundaries.

I didn't mention this last time. It is forbidden, according to Jewish law, it your prayers it is a sacrilege to

go out and get on your cell phone. You are just stepping all over the law. You can't go out in the middle and start making phonecalls, this is a medical emergency. You don't make phonecalls in the middle of prayers. I'm told to leave in the middle of prayers and go out and start talking. You're not allowed to. It will look ridiculous, and it's against Jewish law, literally.

THE COURT: I thought you had told me, correct me if I'm wrong, when you were here last time and described the circumstances of the bris, you had said that you arrived and you saw these other children there and nonetheless stayed.

THE DEFENDANT: Correct.

THE COURT: It did not sound to me as though the service and the prayers had commenced and it was a question of you interrupting -- let me finish, thank you -- interrupting a service and leaving. Those are different things, going into a situation and engaging in a situation as opposed to not going into the situation at all.

THE DEFENDANT: I agree a hundred percent with your Honor, of course. Nevertheless, there are a lot of similarities. Unfortunately, I was late. There is only one prayer going on over here, and I am late as can be. I'm running in.

To start leaving and start making phonecalls, it would also be really questionable. But part of the things were that

# Iacase 1.15-cr-00139-LTS Document 97 Filed 12/03/18 Page 18 of 31

had more minors showed up in the middle of the thing, I would have to make another phonecall, so to speak.

What I'm bringing out --

2.3

THE COURT: You didn't --

THE DEFENDANT: What I did was wrong. I'm not saying it was right. What I'm bringing out is it was difficult, very difficult circumstances to be able to totally comply. I just mean it wasn't defiant. It was a situation that was extremely difficult. Not like I couldn't care less and I'm defiant, I'm thumbing my nose at the system. It's never been that way, ever.

I have been off my anxiety pills for 7 months. I went back on them now because the anxiety I have been under these past three hearings has been quite a lot to me. I know it may sound like a short-term. It's devastating, really devastating. I have so much going on. It is very difficult not to be around for a week and not to tell anybody and the family and the work, and then four months observation.

This has been a punishment, a serious punishment. As far as my compliance, I learned the hard way that when in doubt, if you have any doubt, you must get in touch with the probation officer. That is what I intend to do.

I have been talking with her about the cell phone back and forth. I wouldn't dream of buying it until we have come to a conclusion. This is the message I'm trying to convey. It is

not a case of defiance, it is not a case of not taking this seriously. It's just there were certain circumstances that do not happen every day.

I can say in my group one guy got a phone with porn on it, another guy had a phone with Internet on it. I didn't dream of getting that. That is not in my dreams. I have not watched any media for over four and a half years in order to keep away from the whole mess. Nothing, no media, period. Forget about porn. I am trying to be careful and making sure not to regress and not to offend.

Thank you for listening.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Waldman.

Ms. Aliperti, you have been accused of lying.

MS. ALIPERTI: Yes. To clarify what AUSA Hellman had said, he was excused on the Mondays. What was relayed to me in regards to treatment was his therapist did make an attempt to schedule him another day that week, meaning he could be excused on Monday, because no one wanted to interfere with his religion.

But the individual session, in which there is more flexibility -- as a group, it is tough to reschedule multiple people -- there was an attempt made to redo what happened on a different day. He had informed them that his schedule between work, prayer, would not allow him to reschedule.

Because the religious holiday is an excused absence,

 Iackset
 1.15-cr-00139-LTS
 Document 97
 Filed 12/03/18
 Page 20 of 31

there were some attempts made. If he says no and if he can't fit into the therapist's schedule, that's why there was an absence for the other days that they attempted to reschedule.

In regards to the cell phone, what Mr. Waldman is discussing -- Tag is a software. I have done due diligence and I have spoken to whomever we needed to. It is a software that they put onto a phone to remove certain capabilities. They could pick choose what app.

Unfortunately, which was relayed to Mr. Waldman, because it is a software, any individual can factory reset their phone on any day and the software is removed. That will not go with the computer monitoring because if Mr. Waldman factory resets his phone, he can have a browser back, do whatever he wants, and we would be none the wiser unless we were checking his phone daily to make sure.

I spoke to Tag. Tag said absolutely, people have reset the phone and have gained access. Therefore, just removing the browser to get Internet capability will not work in regards to the computer monitoring.

What Mr. Waldman is referencing about the tablet, in the Eastern District, due to resources, we do not monitor smartphones. We had suggested a Windows-based tablet which is much smaller than a laptop and more portable, can be monitored at its full capacity. Meaning he would have a browser and be able to look at Google and we would know exactly what he was

Ia@awaly.15-cr-00139-LTS Document 97 Filed 12/03/18 Page 21 of 31 doing.

Where the issue with the children came up, when Mr. Waldman and I were discussing it, he had emailed me about the tablets, saying that he had found one that was smaller, and he was assuring me that he would get it tagged, which was what we were discussing before, put the software on it, for his children's school purpose.

That's what prompted me to say, Mr. Waldman, if you remember, we had amended your conditions to show that you are the only person who can access and have control, possess, and use your device. There were emails back and forth. We were reiterating the point.

I did not make up that he was buying the tablet for his children. He was relaying that as part of having a tablet, he would implement the Tag for his children's school purposes. That's why I had then clarified to make sure again we weren't getting him into a pickle in terms of having devices or letting people access them that he shouldn't have had access to.

Two issues about the bris. The reason why Mr. Waldman was permitted to go to the bris this time was, again, I had spoken to multiple people. There were at least three people. I spoke to the rabbi, his father-in-law, his children were there, his wife. Again, the circumstances were told us there were going to be no other minors except for Mr. Waldman's family members, who were all fully aware of his offense with

 Ia@a%e 1.15-cr-00139-LTS
 Document 97
 Filed 12/03/18
 Page 22 of 31

the addition of the responsible adult.

2.3

If that has changed, we were unaware of that to this day. We were operating, like the prior bris, that it was a ceremony just with family, and if there were changes, he would have needed to let us know that accordingly.

In hearing Mr. Waldman speak, when he says he is not defiant and that as soon as the contact with minors was explained to him, he stopped cold turkey, that is false. I have had to explain to him multiple times that he cannot have contact with minors, so much so that at the last time when this issue was discussed, I had him come in, sit in front of me, and read his judgment to me to make sure he understood, because it was still happening.

He was going to therapy saying so-and-so came over after I would say to him you can't have contact with minors. So it wasn't a one-and-done cold turkey. We wouldn't be here today if he was in compliance and was doing what he was supposed to and it wouldn't have been a further issue that needed to be addressed.

MS. WEINRAUCH: Your Honor, if I could say one thing also. I was the original supervising officer of Mr. Waldman in the Eastern District. These issues that are coming up today with the cell phone and with the contact with minors are all issues that we have been discussing here in court and during my term of supervision with Mr. Waldman. This is repetitive

behavior that has not stopped despite location monitoring, home confinement, being placed in the halfway house as a result of the sentence on the offense.

That is why the probation department is requesting the custodial term, because these instances have continued and Mr. Waldman has secured cell phones without permission that have had Internet on them. Whether he knew that before he got them or not, this has been a repetitive behavior of all these noncompliances, and that is where we come from today with our recommendation.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Waldman.

2.3

Did you want to speak with Mr. Waldman before he speaks further, Mr. Marvinny?

MR. MARVINNY: No.

THE DEFENDANT: I would like to challenge and make true this case. I would like to challenge Ms. Aliperti to show any contact with the therapist and myself with any of those missed sessions. I promise you you will not find a single contact — not a phonecall, not a text, and not an email. None whatsoever were made to me about redoing a missed session.

I recall Victoria emailing Ms. Aliperti during the last session telling her all the times that I need off. I told the therapist with holidays and everything. There very well may have been discussion between them about maybe rescheduling.

#### Iacase 1:15-cr-00139-LTS Document 97 Filed 12/03/18 Page 24 of 31

2.3

Not a word, not a text, not an email, not a phonecall. I challenge the Court to find this was said to me, period. That is one thing.

The second things is I have the email that shows not what Ms. Aliperti just said. That is, I have the email showing that I openly said that the other side of the family does not know about my situation and they may be bringing children, minors. I have that email. So she was well aware of it. It's in the email.

Nevertheless, she was kind enough, since the rabbi was keeping an eye on me and my father was keeping an eye on me, those were the two official phonecalls that were made: you have to be careful, even if you go to the bathroom, be careful. That I was totally compliant with. To say it was different is not true. I clearly wrote an email. She asked me will there be other ones, and I answered her the truth: yes, the other half of the family will be bringing minors to that.

THE COURT: Would you read that email? You have it there?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't have it here. I didn't know this was going to be brought up. I have it at my house. She should have it in her emails also. These are open things that we can easily prove.

THE COURT: What I will say with respect to the sessions is that since there is a dispute as to the specifics

of the interactions regarding the sessions, the question of not making up sessions in relation to the recent religious holidays will not form any part of the basis of my decision as to the sanction. So it's not necessary to have a hearing.

THE DEFENDANT: With the cell phone there was one instance. That was another violation. We went through this last time. I was as careful as can be. I have all the Amazon clippings and we have all the questions that you asked on Amazon. You asked the people about it. These are not owners of it. These are people who bought it, and they respond, like the group thing, and they tell you about the cell phone. They all said it's a dumb phone.

The second I got it and I saw it was not a dumb phone, I went to two sites, totally kosher sites, saw, uh-oh, there is a possibility of seeing a figure. I immediately stopped. I notified. This went to forensics, which came back clear showing that it was exactly the same I said, that I did not go anywhere.

It was a misjudgment. I should have been maybe more careful. But these are not things that you throw the book at a person for.

THE COURT: But you were not supposed to get it at all without prior approval.

THE DEFENDANT: True if there is Internet. If there is no Internet, that is technically the main issue. I was

Iacase 1.15-cr-00139-LTS	Document 97	Filed 12/03/18	Page 26 of 31
--------------------------	-------------	----------------	---------------

under the impression there was no Internet. As soon as I saw it was incorrect, I did not use it, period. I told my therapist the next day. That was Saturday night-Sunday.

Monday morning 10 a.m., 10:30, I told me therapist what happened. This is not a person who is defiant and doesn't care and is hiding and trying to get away. I told her. No one forced me to.

I told Ms. Aliperti next day, she asked me, were there minors there? I could have lied. Who is going to know the difference? I told her straight out, yes, there was, and I apologized to her. I came down here and apologized. I just tried to explain to her it was an impossible situation.

This is not a person who is defiant, doesn't care, and he is getting around things. I am not that person. I have been trying to do my best. These have been difficult circumstances, some mistakes here and there. But believe me I have learned very much over these past few hearings. I do not have to be punished. I have been punished. I'm telling you, I'm back on anxiety pills. It's not good.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Waldman.

Will you all sit quietly for a few minutes while  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$  reflect on everything that  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$  have heard and make my decision.

(Continued on next page)

2.3

THE COURT: Thank you for your patience. I have considered very carefully everything that has been said here today, all of our prior sessions and interactions as well, and I have considered the remarks and factual proffers and events in light of the relevant sentencing factors for a supervised release violation as set forth in Section 3553(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code and 3553(c).

Mr. Waldman has made progress with his therapy and his understanding to some degree of the changes that are necessary in his day-to-day life, and I commend him for that, but the road that brings us here today has been one of resistance. I am not using the word defiance. That is a word that Mr. Waldman has used, but that's not my word. But I do use the word resistance to supervision, and a pattern of rationalization of noncompliance after multiple instructions by the probation department as to what is required by conditions that I set out very clearly at the original sentencing.

I find that there is a need to promote deterrence and respect for the terms of Mr. Waldman's sentence by demonstrating that a major consequence of the crime of which he was convicted is that the sentence restricts the way he interacts with his community, which includes many children. I find that Mr. Waldman must experience true physical separation from that community for a short period of time.

The Court's accommodation of his request that his

original sentence be served in a halfway house with furloughs for observance in his religious community did not accomplish apparently this essential purpose of the sentence, nor did the earlier period of home detention sufficiently accomplish that purpose of the sentence and the restrictions that have been imposed.

The Court's goal in imposing the sentence that will be imposed today is that Mr. Waldman will be sufficiently attuned to the requirements of his supervised release by the sanctions imposed in this proceeding, that he will be compliant and entirely worthy of the Court's trust going forward, and that will also support and promote his continued healing and growth into new internal attitudes completely and a new and appropriate relationship with the community including the children in the community.

I will now state the sentence that I intend to impose.

Mr. Waldman and Mr. Marvinny, would you please stand.

Mr. Waldman, it is the judgment of this Court that you are to serve seven days of imprisonment, to be followed by a six year term of supervised release.

So, to be clear, I am revoking the current term of supervised release, imposing a sentence of seven days of imprisonment and reimposing a six year term of supervised release to follow that, which will include four months of home detention with location monitoring.

2.3

All of the prior mandatory standard and special conditions as modified until today will be reimposed as well.

The location monitoring and home detention condition will be as follows: You must comply with the conditions of home detention for a period of four months. During this time you will remain at your place of residence except for employment, religious observation and other activities approved by your probation officer. You must maintain a telephone at your place of residence that does not have call forwarding, a modem, caller ID, call waiting or portable cordless telephones for this period.

At the direction of the probation officer, you shall wear an electronic monitoring device and follow electronic monitoring procedures specified by your probation officer. The home detention shall commence on a date to be determined by the probation officer. And you must pay the cost of home detention on a self payment or copayment basis, as directed by the probation officer.

The seven day term will start on a Monday. I am directing that Mr. Waldman report to the marshals by 2 p.m. on Monday, November 4, and I will recommend that Mr. Waldman must be provided a Kosher diet.

MR. MARVINNY: Your Honor, may I interject? I think the 4th is a Sunday.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. That's right, the 4th is a

# IAMANA 12-cr-00139-LTS Document 97 Filed 12/03/18 Page 30 of 31

1 | Sunday. It would be November 5.

2.3

MR. MARVINNY: My request would have been that Mr. Waldman be permitted to report on Monday the 19th of November. That is a week that would be easier. That is, Thanksgiving week would be a week that would be easier for him to accommodate his work needs. I think the work will be much slower that week, and I think he was hoping to serve his time during that week.

THE COURT: I was looking for a week that didn't clearly have any major religious holidays in it, and for some reason -- the week of November 19 doesn't appear to have any major religious holidays. So, Monday, November 19.

I believe that this sentence is reasonable within the meaning of the law, appropriate and no greater than necessary to address the statutory purposes of sentencing.

Does either counsel know of any legal reasons why the sentence should not be imposed as stated?

MR. HELLMAN: No.

MR. MARVINNY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: The sentence as stated is imposed.

Is there a motion to dismiss the remaining specifications?

MR. HELLMAN: Yes, I make that motion that all remaining specifications be dismissed in satisfaction.

THE COURT: That motion is granted. I must say

something to you about your appeal rights, Mr. Waldman.

You have the right to appeal this sentence. If you are unable to pay the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. At your request, the Clerk of the Court will file a notice of appeal for you. Any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of entry of the judgment.

And, Ms. Aliperti, is the articulation of the conditions consistent with what probation needs in terms of an administrative point of view?

MS. ALIPERTI: Yes. And just one other point to clarify. Because Mr. Waldman's term of supervision was revoked, would you like him to still remain supervised until his self surrender date by our office?

THE COURT: Yes. So, I am stating that on the record that the current conditions of supervision remain in place until the surrender date, and so I suppose I will express it that the term is revoked as of the surrender date, which is November 19, and then will be reimposed following the release from the seven days.

Is that all clear, or do we need to go over anything else?

All right. Thank you all. And I wish you good luck. We are adjourned.

\_ \_